

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 17, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-21 were pending and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 16 and 21 have been amended and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-21 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 14-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Dell and Henson patents '383 and '815. Page 17 of the Office Action rejects claims 4, 9, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Dell, Henson '383 and Rosen.

In the Action, the Examiner compares the one-to-one delivery date feature of the claims with the option advisor current lead time and points to col. 6, lines 62-67, col. 7, lines 38-40 and col. 8, lines 25-55.

This text states:

Secondly, the lead time advisor includes an "option advisor" section generally indicated at 90 (FIG. 4). The option advisor 90 is activated upon selection of the optimize ship date selection button 84 of the configuration display 63 (FIG. 3). The option advisor 90 includes a display section for displaying the option or options 92 dictating the current lead time. For instance, in the illustrative embodiment of FIG. 4, the components of the customer configured computer system resulting in the July 17 ship date 82 (FIG. 3) includes a Sony 1000HS Monitor 92a and the 128 MB RAM 92b. The Sony 1000HS Monitor and 128 MB RAM are part of the configuration of FIG. 3 generally indicated at 86.

See Henson '815, Col. 6, line 61- col. 7, line 1

In one illustrative embodiment, the at least one recommendation 94 includes an identification and/or description. As shown in FIG. 4, the recommendation for an alternate selection for the SONY 1000 HS Monitor includes three options 94a which can result in a lowered lead time if selected. The three options include a Dell 19LS Monitor, a Dell 21FP Monitor, and a SONY 1200 HS Monitor. The recommendation further includes change in price messaging, for example, Subtract \$29, Add \$19, and Add \$99, as shown for each of the respective recommendations 94a. The recommendation may still further include an indication on lead time improvement such as change to ship date of a prescribed number of days earlier.

See Henson '815, Col. 7, lines 28-40

As shown in FIG. 4, each recommendation includes a corresponding change to ship date indication. The change to ship date refers to a potential lead time improvement indication by a prescribed number of days, e.g., up to 2 days earlier, up to 3 days earlier, etc. Lead time advisor 74 calculates the lead time improvement differential or delta, for example, by taking the difference between the lead time of the prior component and the lead time of the at least one recommendation. In addition, each alternate recommendation includes a change in price indication. Lead time advisor 74 calculates the change in price differential by taking the difference between the price of the prior component and price of the

at least one recommendation.

According to an embodiment of the present disclosure, presentation of the delivery/lead time related information can be carried out in two parts. In a first part, online store computer system 10 provides a simple display 80 of the estimated delivery time 82 based upon a read of current system component selections (FIG.3). The display 80 includes the ability to access, via hyperlink 84, advice and assistance on how to improve or optimize delivery time (i.e., ship date). In a second part, lead time advisor 74 of online store computer system 10 provides a dynamic database-driven web page where the option(s) dictating the current displayed delivery time and any identified recommendations are presented for customer consideration. Ship date of any one component may be affected, for example, because the particular component is currently out of stock, etc. The two-part display is implemented in recognition of space limitations with the online configuration, however, the same could be implemented on a single web page.

See Henson '815, Col. 8, lines 25-56

The above text of Henson discusses lead time in the context of a ship date. In addition see:

According to one embodiment, in a method for advising on a lead time for a customer configured computer system, selection input is received from a customer. In response to the selection input, a customer computer system is configured. Lead time for the configured computer system is advised by outputting an estimated ship date for delivery of the configured computer system to the customer. The estimated ship date is a function of lead times of selected options of the configured computer system. Lead time is further advised by outputting a customer selectable option for optimizing the ship date.

See Henson '815, Col. 2, lines 22-32

The present embodiments provide a means for optimizing the lead time for a customer configured computer system. More specifically, a method and apparatus are provided for an online store having a configuration for configuring a customer's computer system. The configuration includes a lead time advisor for informing online shoppers of the lead time for a respective computer system, the lead time being based on current component selections. The lead time advisor takes into account the specific option(s) dictating the current lead time (i.e., the longest lead time component) and the effect that each component selection has upon the resultant system lead time.

See Henson '815, Col. 2, lines 64- col. 3, line 8

According to the present embodiments, online configuration 62 includes a lead time advisor 74 having at least two components. First, the lead time advisor 74 includes a "lead time" display 80, as illustrated in FIG. 3, having an estimated ship date 82 and an optimize ship date (i.e., delivery) option 84. The lead time display 80, similar to an online configuration price display, is provided for displaying a current lead time based upon a current computer system configuration of component selections. The lead time is preferably displayed in terms of days, however, any other suitable time measure may be utilized as may be desired for a particular online store application. Lead time display 80 accordingly displays an estimated ship date 82 based upon the lead times of the current configuration component selections.

See Henson '815, Col. 6, lines 45-60

In one illustrative embodiment, the at least one recommendation 94 includes an

identification and/or description. As shown in FIG. 4, the recommendation for an alternate selection for the SONY 1000 HS Monitor includes three options 94a which can result in a lowered lead time if selected. The three options include a Dell 19LS Monitor, a Dell 21FP Monitor, and a SONY 1200 HS Monitor. The recommendation further includes change in price messaging, for example, Subtract \$29, Add \$19, and Add \$99, as shown for each of the respective recommendations 94a. The recommendation may still further include an indication on lead time improvement such as change to ship date of a prescribed number of days earlier.

See Henson '815, Col. 7, lines 28-40

As can be seen, a current lead time is not provided to the customer in Henson '815, but rather and "estimated ship date" or an "optimized ship date" and, as shown in figure 4, changes to the ship date.

Nor is a delivery date provided to the customer by Henson '815, but rather versions of a ship date are provided.

However, claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 16 and 21 have been to clarify that the "parts are listed with corresponding one-to-one individual number of days which it takes to deliver the custom-made product to the customer". It is submitted that Henson '815 does not teach or suggest such.

Dell, Henson '383 and Rosen add nothing to Henson '815 with respect to the above discussed feature.

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 3 calls for an "estimated delivery time". As discussed above, the prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 15, 2008

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501